

this amendment in the committee, but I was told not to do it there, to wait until we go to the floor. Now I am on the floor and I am being told do not do it here. So I am sort of stuck in a way. I do not want to tie up a bill. I think defense production is important, but to have to wait 5 more years to come back with this idea is something I do not want to do, either. So I am using this time to encourage people who may have a better idea on how we can resolve this to make some suggestions so we can avoid holding up this legislation.

I do not need to remind my colleagues, I would just say at the end of all of this, that since 2001 we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs in the United States. In Connecticut, we have lost more than 14 out of every 100 manufacturing jobs in the past 3 years. I have 5,400 small manufacturers in my State of over 240,000 people. A lot of them are what we call mom and pop, with 5, 6, 8, 10 people. Some of them are second and third generation.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire, as well as my colleague from Ohio. They have similar situations with small firms in their own States. Many of them provide critical technologies to our major defense contractors. If I thought the offset agreements had some great relevancy today, I would be the first to say we have to live with this; it is an unfortunate reality. But taking an idea we used at the end of World War II to help our allies get on their feet and to still perpetuate it in the year 2003 I think is wrong.

We better say something about it soon and try to do something about it before we just continue the way we are going and seeing a further loss of jobs and a loss of a manufacturing base in critical technologies which I think we will regret deeply in the years to come.

When this bill comes up, if it does come up, I would like to offer the amendment or have someone work out something so we might address this issue in some way that would not delay the enactment of the Defense Production Act but would give me some sense of hope that we could resolve this kind of problem.

I yield the floor.

BIRTHDAY WISHES TO GEORGE GOLSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to express my congratulations and best wishes to George Golson on the occasion of his 90th birthday. A devoted husband, a father of four children, an industrious businessman, an accomplished jurist, and a veteran of World War II, George Golson has led a distinguished life.

Born on October 24, 1913, George received his undergraduate education at the University of Columbia, NY, and his legal education at St. John's University. After practicing law for several years in New York, he served his

country proudly for 4 years during World War II in the Judge Adjutant General office in Liverpool, England.

Upon his return from military service, George Golson built a new home in Columbia, SC, and launched a new career in business. He returned to legal practice in 1958 as a member of the South Carolina Bar, and in 1973 was admitted to serve as Attorney of Law in the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1980, George Golson established an office in Las Vegas to provide consulting services on legal matters in the field of real estate planning. He became a respected and beloved member of the southern Nevada community, and his work contributed to the dramatic growth and development of the State.

Throughout his long and productive life, George has made the most of his free time. He has challenged himself both intellectually and athletically by writing short stories, composing ballads, music, and lyrics, fishing, and playing racquetball.

Please join me in wishing George Golson the happiest of birthdays.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was unable to participate in last evening's vote on the nomination of Carlos Bea to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit due to my participation in a memorial service for Rhode Island National Guardsmen killed while serving in Iraq.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in Houston, TX. On May 25, 2003, a Houston high school student was attacked by a teacher's aide in class because he is gay. The teacher's aide, also an assistant coach at the school, allegedly taunted the student with comments about his sexual orientation over the course of the school year. The incident was in full view of the class and was later corroborated by seven or eight other students.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Mr. Mark

Shields, whose syndicated column appears in more than 100 newspapers, including The Washington Post and the St. Petersburg Times, paid tribute in a recent column to our dear friend and colleague, the Honorable ERNEST F. HOLLINGS.

That column was most insightful, as it examined the character of Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS, who, unfortunately, has announced that he will not be seeking reelection to the U.S. Senate after nearly four decades of service in this Chamber.

I hope that throughout the history of our Nation there will always be a FRITZ HOLLINGS. As Mr. Shields noted in his column, FRITZ HOLLINGS "was a leader of uncommon courage and uncommon candor." Indeed, FRITZ HOLLINGS' leadership, courage, and candor will be sorely missed.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shields' column, as it appeared on September 5, 2003, in The State, one of the newspapers in Senator HOLLINGS' home State of South Carolina, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CANDIDATE WITH THAT RAREST OF ATTRIBUTES: CANDOR (By Mark Shields)

On Oct. 6, 1983, in a televised debate among Democratic presidential candidates, one candidate said the following about the 1,800 U.S. Marines whom the Reagan administration had then sent to warring Lebanon: "If they were sent there to fight, they were too few. If they were sent there to die, they are too many."

Less than three years later in Beirut, just before dawn on Oct. 23, a terrorist driving a truck loaded with thousands of pounds of explosives plowed into the Marine barracks and killed 241 Americans.

That same presidential candidate went on Nov. 4, 1983, to Dartmouth College, a prestigious Ivy League school with an advantaged student body, and shocked the undergraduates: "I want to draft everyone in this room for the good of the country."

He was not advocating the "old Vietnam-style draft, where if you had enough money, you were either in college or in Canada." His campus audience gasped at the man's discomforting bluntness: "Conscience tells us that we need a cross-section of America in our armed forces. Defense is everybody's business . . . everybody's responsibility. A professional army is un-American. It is anathema to a democratic republic—a glaring civil wrong."

You like candor in your political leaders? This Democrat truly brimmed with the stuff.

That July, to a Washington gathering of the National Council of Senior Citizens—a group with political clout in its membership and Social Security and Medicare benefits on its agenda—he refused to coddle.

Instead, in the face of runaway federal budget deficits, he reminded the seniors, not of the obligations owed to them, but of the seniors' own obligation "to your children and grandchildren." He, alone, would say, "If I'm elected, I will freeze your cost-of-living adjustments for a year."

To a Capitol Hill meeting of defense contractors, pleased and prosperous with President Reagan's doubling of the Pentagon budget, the candidate, himself a combat veteran of World War II, had been frank: "If I'm